BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD STATE OF WASHINGTON

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

26

KAREN GERRITS. Appellant, Case No. ALLO-00-0018 v. ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING, DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR Respondent.

Hearing on Exceptions. Pursuant to RCW 41.64.060 and WAC 358-01-040, this matter came on for a hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair, on Appellant's exceptions to the Director's determination dated May 8, 2000. The hearing was held on February 7, 2001, in the Personnel Appeals Board hearing room in Olympia, Washington. LEANA D. LAMB, Member, reviewed the record and participated in the decision in this matter. WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, did not participate in the hearing or in the decision in this matter.

Appearances. Appellant Karen Gerrits was present and represented herself *pro se*. Respondent Department of Licensing (DOL) was represented by Jan Smallwood, Human Resource Director.

Background. As a result of a class study, the Washington State Personnel Resources Board adopted revisions to the information technology classes. Appellant's Computer Information Consultant 3 position was reallocated to the new Information Technology Applications Specialist (ITAS) 4 classification. Jeanie Deppiesse, Human Resource Consultant, informed Appellant of her reallocation by letter dated July 20, 1999.

By letter dated August 17, 1999, Appellant appealed to the Director of the Department of Personnel (DOP). In her letter of appeal, Appellant requested that her position be reallocated to the Information Technology Application Specialist (ITAS) 5 classification.

> Personnel Appeals Board 2828 Capitol Boulevard Olympia, Washington 98504

1 C 2 A 3 P 4 C 5 V 6 A 7 a 8 tl 9 A 10 tl 11 a a

On March 14, 2000, the DOP Director's designee, Paul Peterson, conducted an allocation review of Appellant's position. By letter dated May 8, 2000, Mr. Peterson determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the Information Technology Applications Specialist 4 classification. On June 2, 2000, Appellant filed timely exceptions to the Director's determination with the Personnel Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

Appellant's position is responsible for the DOL's automated Master License Service (MLS) application. Appellant's CQ indicates that the MLS is a mission critical, high-risk agency program that impacts external customers, other state agencies and other government entities. While Appellant is responsible for the application, her supervisor is the system architect responsible for the total system. All parties agree that the MLS application is a "major, high risk/high impact application" and is encompassed by the ITAS 5. The issue on exceptions is whether the ITAS 5 level requires responsibility for the application or for the system.

Summary of Appellant's Argument. Appellant argues that the ITAS 5 classification is intended to encompass positions that work with applications not with systems as determined by the director's designee. Appellant further argues that she is responsible for the MLS application while her supervisor is responsible for the system. Therefore, Appellant contends that her position should be allocated to the ITAS 5 classification.

Summary of Respondent's Argument. Respondent argues that Appellant is responsible for a portion of the MLS system and is not responsible for the system as a whole. Respondent further argues that the MLS application is not agency-wide but rather is specific to the MLS system. Respondent asserts that Appellant's position is properly allocated to the ITAS 4 classification.

Primary Issue. Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the Information Technology Applications Specialist 4 classification should be affirmed.

1

2 3

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

26

Relevant Classifications. Information Technology Applications Specialist 4, class code 03294, and Information Technology Applications Specialist 5, class code 03295.

Decision of the Board. The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

At the ITAS 4 level, incumbents perform professional-level duties with a focus on system specific applications rather than agency-wide applications and are responsible for "multiple applications of moderate size/complexity or a large, major application that is vital to program delivery."

At the ITAS 5 level, incumbents are professional, technical specialists whose are responsible for agency-level, large-scale applications, projects or databases that have high risk and high impact. Incumbents at this level utilize broad technical knowledge in analyzing, consulting, designing, programming, maintaining, or supporting major applications, support products, projects, databases or database management systems.

We agree with the Director's designee that the MLS application falls within the ITAS 5 classification. However, we disagree with his determination that responsibility for the MLS system is key to the allocation. The ITAS 5 specification clearly refers to responsibility for agency-level, large-scale, major applications which is precisely what the MLS is. Appellant has responsibility for the MLS application. Furthermore, the record before the Board shows that the MLS application has agency-wide impact as well as impact on outside entities and governments and on all business

1	owners in the state of Washington. Appellant's duties and responsibilities fall within the ITAS 5
2	classification.
3456	Conclusion. The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be granted and her position should be reallocated to the Information Technology Applications Specialist 5 classification. The determination of the Director, dated May 8, 2000, should be reversed.
7	ORDER
8	NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is
9	granted, the determination of the Director, dated May 8, 2000, is reversed, and Appellant's position
10	is reallocated to the Information Technology Applications Specialist 5 classification.
11	DATED this, 2001.
12	WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD
13	
14 15	Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair
16	Serara Zi Horgen, Tree, chair
17	
18	Leana D. Lamb, Member
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	